

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/647,278	HOCK, JANET M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ruixiang Li	1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ruixiang Li. (3) Thomas D. Webster.
 (2) Evonne Eyler. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 35 and 65-68.

Identification of prior art discussed: Neer et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,698,328, October 1987; The Extra Pharmacopia The Pharmaceutical Press, 29th ed., 1989, page 1338.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Ruixiang Li
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The issues related to rejection of amended claims 35, 65-68 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,698,328, October 1987) set forth in Paper No. 14 were discussed. Applicants argued that the reference of Neer et al. does not anticipate the currently claimed invention because the cited reference does not teach reducing the risk of vertebral and non-vertebral bone fracture by the PTH (1-34) treatment and does not teach the specific dosage used in the method of treatment. Applicants would consider submitting evidence showing that the Examiner has used a wrong PTH standard for converting the dosage of Neer et al. from units to ug. The Examiner maintained that a prima facie case has been established for the reasons of record.